

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above application.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### II. Prior Art Rejections

A. Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Windows 2000 Kerberos Authentication White Paper (hereafter the Kerberos article).<sup>1</sup>

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed in a prior art reference as arranged in the claim. See, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The Kerberos article does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-24. More particularly, the Kerberos article does not disclose to use more than one copy of authorization data as recited by amended claims 1, 15, 18 and 24, whereby the second copy of the authorization data is not contained in a ticket and is encrypted. The Kerberos article merely discloses to use two steps to gather authentication data. Kerberos, pg 27. The first step is to prepare a TGT and the second step is to prepare a session ticket. Kerberos, pg. 27. While the Office action kindly points to a statement in Kerberos that “the KDC in the server’s domain copies the contents of the TGT’s authorization data field to the session ticket’s authorization data field”, the Office action respectfully reads too much into this operation. Particularly, there is no suggestion that the TGT authorization is the same data as a service ticket authorization (ST

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant again notes that the Office action cites to page 32 of the Kerberos article. However, the copy of the Kerberos article provided to Applicant has only 29 pages. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a complete copy of the Kerberos article.

authorization). Notably, as explained on page 19 of Kerberos, the “authentication service” provides the “TGT from the authentication service in the user’s account domain,” while the “ticket granting service” provides tickets in the “service’s account domain.” Accordingly, there is no suggestion that authorization for accessing the “ticket granting service” in the user account domain may provide access to the “service account domain,” as implied in the rejection. Moreover, Kerberos clearly does not disclose a second copy of the authorization data which is not contained in a ticket and encrypted when sent to the client, as recited by the amended claims.

As the Kerberos article does not disclose each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 15, 18 or 24, the Kerberos article does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, the Kerberos article also does not anticipate claims 2-14, 16-18, and 19-23 which depend on independent claims 1, 15 and 18, respectively, and incorporate all of the limitations thereof, respectively.

### III. Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Lawrence T. Cullen/  
Lawrence T. Cullen  
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions  
101 Tournament Drive  
Horsham, PA 19044  
(215) 323-1797